

**UNC Workgroup 0431S Agenda  
Shipper/Transporter – Meter Point Portfolio Reconciliation**

**Thursday 26 June 2013**

**at ENA, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF**

**Attendees**

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Alan Raper	(AR)	National Grid Distribution
Andrea Varkonyi	(AV)	First Utility
Andrew Margan	(AM)	British Gas
Anne Jackson	(AJ)	SSE
Chris Hill	(CH)	Cornwall Energy
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Edward Hunter	(EH)	RWE npower
Erika Melén	(EM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Gareth Evans	(GE)	Waters Wye
Hilary Chapman	(HCh)	Xoserve
Huw Comerford	(HC)	Utilita
Marie Clark	(MC)	Scottish Power
Naomi Anderson	(NA)	EDF Energy
Robert Cameron-Higgs*	(RCH)	Wales & West Utilities
Tim Davis (Secretary)	(TD)	Joint Office
Tom Breckwoldt	(TB)	Gazprom Energy

\* *via teleconference*

Copies of all papers are available at: [www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0431/260613](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0431/260613)

The Workgroup Report is due to the UNC Modification Panel by 18 July 2013.

**1.0 Review of Minutes and Actions from previous meeting**

**1.1. Minutes**

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted.

**1.2. Actions**

No outstanding actions for review.

**2.0 Workgroup Report**

DM outlined the changes made to the Business Rules. AJ asked what would happen if an iGT MPRN was submitted inadvertently. DM said this would be rejected as it would be identified as such. However, AJ said the Business Rules state that non-recognised MPRNs would be added to the database and asked how it would be determined if any such MPRN is genuine or not. DA felt this was clear in Business Rule 6, requiring the Shipper to register any new MPRN – he asked if any duplication in Business rule 9 might usefully be deleted. DM agreed to do this.

AM asked if 'billable' is a defined term in the legal text. DM confirmed this is clarified in the legal text. AM was not convinced the definition was clear for "billable" and also asked which registration date was envisaged to be involved – a number are possible. EM explained that nothing retrospective was involved.

AM asked about the impact of erroneous transfers - how would both Shippers being auto-registered be avoided? How would you avoid the erroneous transfer being repeated by the Shipper registering a site in response to this new process? EM explained that the response should be that the meter point is subject to an erroneous transfer and so it would not be automatically registered. AM was not clear how this could deal with timing issues when a snapshot of a portfolio is provided. The concern was how to deal with churn and address timing issues when they would want their own data to settle down before looking to address any outstanding difficulties following transfer. Duplication and overlap could occur because of the snapshot approach. EM did not see how this could be a problem when the site is unregistered – without registration, how could the transfer be erroneous. Shippers suggested this would be because of a mismatch in systems. Shippers would be dealing with each other and registering sites, but the data may not have been passed to Xoserve and so an unregistered site could be involved. Different Shippers could believe they are responsible for the same site. DA responded that where a duplicate is identified – being on more than one Shipper portfolio – Xoserve would address the situation by flagging this as a duplicate. DA suggested amending the Business Rules to clarify the position.

GE asked about different classifications of 'dead' sites and how they would fit in the process. DA suggested that truly dead sites would not be on the list at all since only live sites were to be covered. However, AJ was concerned that some issues could be missed as the dead sites may not match between Xoserve and Shipper systems. AM asked if a vacant site would be defined as billable – CW said it should be registered and so not be a Shipperless issue. AJ emphasised that a range of anomalies would exist and could create problems. AR responded that if Shippers are not billing sites, then Transporters are not concerned with the information since the aim of the modification is to ensure registration of sites that are being billed. EM suggested it may be helpful if Xoserve checked for dead status before issuing the reports in order to try and reduce anomalies. AJ suggested adding dead and extinct to Business Rule 6, which EM agreed to consider.

There was a general concern that the range of anomalies was such that the modification could be expected to create a great deal of work for Shippers – potentially creating a sledge hammer to crack a nut.

It was agreed that an interim Workgroup Report should be sent to the Modification Panel proposing that further time should be allowed for assessment. The Workgroup considered that, given the changes made to the Modification since it was raised, the Modification Panel might usefully reconsider whether the self-governance criteria are still met. When the Workgroup Report is submitted to the Panel, a recommendation can be made that the Workgroup considers that self-governance is no longer appropriate.

### **3.0 Any Other Business**

None.

### **6.0 Diary Planning**

Further details of planned meetings are available at: [www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary](http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary)

The next meeting will take place within the Distribution Workgroup on:

Monday 15 July 2013 at 10:30, Consort House, 6 Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3QQ